

But they chased him and shot him and killed him at a restaurant kitchen. He died 8 days later on February 26.

"Black leaders in Selma decided to defuse the community's anger by planning a long march—54 miles—from Selma to the state capitol at Montgomery."

"On March 7, 1965, the marchers set out. As they crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge, state troopers and other law enforcement officers met the unarmed marchers with billy clubs, bullwhips, and tear gas."

They fractured the skull of John Lewis and beat Amelia Boynton unconscious.

"A newspaper photograph of the 54-year-old Boynton, seemingly dead in the arms of another marcher, illustrated the depravity of those determined to stop Black voting."

I tell that story about Bloody Sunday because, very often, people don't hear the whole story. It was just a march. What was going on? Why did they do all that? It involved the right to vote—the right to vote in America. Is there anything more fundamental? Is there anything more debated at this point? The Big Lie of the previous President about the results of the last election I hope has been debunked for most Americans who are open to the facts. But we still fight to make sure that States do not restrict the right to vote. And too many still do.

Why do we make it so hard for residents of America to legally vote? It should be the easiest thing in the world. We shouldn't ask a great personal sacrifice on their part to achieve it.

Heather Cox Richardson makes it a point in her column, and I wanted to recount it on the floor of the Senate. So as we think about Selma, AL, and we think on more than just that picture of people coming over the bridge, we think of the reason they were coming over that bridge: to vote, to be part of America. They have an opportunity to speak in a democracy. It is so fundamental. It is so basic. It is so American.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). The Senator from Alabama.

#### TITLE IX

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, since coming to Washington 2 years ago, I have learned a lot about the Senate and about how Washington works. Politics can, at times, be like a game. While we may be on different teams politically, we should all be focused on winning for all American people. If there is one thing I know about in my last 40 years as a coach and educator, it is trying to win and how to win.

Fifty years ago, we discovered a winning strategy for all of American female athletes. It was called title IX, probably one of the most successful pieces of legislation that has ever come out of this body. Signed into law in

1972, title IX's 37 words empowered women to win by leveling the playing field and providing them access to the same opportunities as young men.

I believe those words are worth repeating today to remind this body of their importance:

No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

Those sometimes on the left argue that allowing males to compete against females makes sports more inclusive. I don't believe that. The opposite, to me, is true. Forcing females to compete against males destroys the level playing field created by law. It would exclude young women from the safety and fairness that they deserve. Title IX's success would be undone if this continues to happen, and that success that title IX is and has been is undeniable.

Since its enactment, participation in female sports has increased by more than 600 percent. Think about that now. In 50 years, because of title IX, the participation in women's sports has increased 600 percent, and the number of female college graduates in the United States increased dramatically from 8 to 40 percent. You don't see things like that happen. Title IX has afforded many women the opportunity to receive athletic scholarships and become our engineers, our doctors, our lawyers, and our leaders, without the burden of having college debt.

Sadly, title IX is being attacked by activists who care more about politics than what is best for women and girls. The U.S. Department of Education is caving—is giving in—to progressive activists and moving ahead with plans to force schools to allow biological males to share locker rooms and compete in women's sports. This irrational and unprecedented move comes despite record numbers of educators, parents, and athletes who have voiced their concerns about the disastrous impact that this would have on female athletes of all ages.

The Department of Education, President Biden, and my colleagues on the left in Congress have ignored those concerns because they care more about appeasing activists and the progressive left than actually protecting young women. I just can't understand this. It is shameful.

Beginning next year, coaches will be forced to decide between opening up locker rooms to biological males or face dire consequences. Allowing biological males to compete against young women is unfair, it is unsafe, and it is wrong. We can't look Americans in the eye and honestly say we support female athletes if we stand by as they are forced into uncomfortable settings they do not deserve, and we can't tell young women we want them to succeed if we allow the radical left to push them to the sidelines of their

sports and take away their future opportunities for scholarships and fair competition. It is not the American way.

If you visited my hometown of Auburn, AL, on a Friday night over the past few months, you would see an arena—thousands of people—full of excited young girls watching the Auburn gymnastics team. Many of them dream of becoming Olympic gymnasts—gymnasts just like Suni Lee, who is an Olympic Gold medalist.

Others make the trip to the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa to see the World Games and to see Montana Fouts on the mound, aspiring to one day become a star softball pitcher at a higher level.

Our girls and young women should be able to continue to dream and compete. Taking away their title IX protections by twisting the law could strip those opportunities for female athletes across our great country.

Since 2003, biological men have won 28 women's sports titles. Let me read that again. Since 2003, biological men have won 28 women's sports titles. We have all heard from athletes like Riley Gaines, the college swimmer who, this past year, bravely spoke out after being forced to share a locker room and the awards podium with a swimmer who had the unfair advantage of swimming in a male body.

Over the weekend, we learned that a judge in Minnesota has ordered the U.S.A. power lifting teams to allow biological men to compete against female power lifters.

Where will this end? When will we step up and say enough is enough? Congress must act to save title IX and make sure competition is safe and fair for everyone, including girls and women. This is why, last week, I reintroduced the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act. This legislation would require institutions to recognize an athlete's gender solely based on what it is at birth or else be banned from receiving Federal funding.

You know, it sounds absurd even to me to say, but, sadly, this legislation is now necessary to preserve title IX for current and future female athletes. It is really sad.

I am thankful for those colleagues here in the Senate who have joined me in standing up for women's sports, and I hope that others will join our efforts in the future.

We have to save title IX. We have to save young girls and women to be able to participate on the same level, with the same funding and access to coaches, as men. Millions of young girls and women are looking to us in this body and to the people across this country, looking to us to stand up for them and that starts with action to ensure that the playing field remains level for generations and generations to come.

This Senate must take up this crucial legislation and help every young woman and young girl in this great country that we live in.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Daniel I. Werfel, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the term expiring November 12, 2027.

##### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

##### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 61, Daniel I. Werfel, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the term expiring November 12, 2027.

Charles E. Schumer, Ron Wyden, Catherine Cortez Masto, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Sherrod Brown, Margaret Wood Hassan, Raphael G. Warnock, Gary C. Peters, Jack Reed, Brian Schatz, Tina Smith, Ben Ray Lujan, Elizabeth Warren, Christopher A. Coons, Martin Heinrich, Christopher Murphy, Tammy Baldwin.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call for the cloture motion filed today, March 6, be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, so, this Thursday, President Biden will release the third budget proposal of his Presidency, one of the most important chances all year to emphasize the contrast between Democrats' and Republicans' vision for the country.

When Americans see President Biden's budget proposal and compare it to the nasty plans coming from Republicans, the contrast will be glaring and unmistakable.

First, President Biden's budget will focus on creating opportunity for aver-

age Americans. He will keep his promise not to raise taxes for anyone making less than \$400,000 a year. He will show how Democrats will keep Medicare solvent for another two decades. And he will lay out a plan—a realistic, serious plan—for lowering the deficit by \$2 trillion over the next 10 years.

Republicans love to talk about cutting the deficit, but Democrats have actually done it. The Inflation Reduction Act lowered the deficit by hundreds of billions of dollars, and we cut the deficit while also cutting prescription drug costs and expanding tax credits for millions of middle-class families.

Now, compare President Biden's budget to the nasty vision laid out by our Republican friends. While the President's budget will keep taxes and costs low for the vast majority of families, Republicans went on record wanting to raise taxes by 30 percent for millions of Americans through their recent national sales tax proposal.

While the President promised no new taxes for people making under \$400,000, the very first bill House Republicans passed helped rich tax cheats get away with paying little or nothing in taxes. And while President Biden and Democrats have been clear that Social Security and Medicare are not on the table, Republicans have proposed raising the retirement age and privatizing certain elements of Medicare. The result: fewer benefits for retirees, higher premiums for Medicare beneficiaries.

We cannot overlook the threat Republicans also pose to Medicaid, which tens of millions of middle-class Americans rely on to ease the burden of paying for nursing homes and assisted living. Democrats want to preserve and strengthen Medicaid, but Republican proposals would cut Medicaid by \$2.2 trillion and end coverage for millions of Americans. That average middle-class family—let's say they are 40, 50 years old, and they are worried about paying for the kids' college, but they also have a parent in a nursing home. Right now, Medicaid would pay for it if the parent doesn't have the resources. With these cuts, that burden will fall on tens of millions of American families in the prime of life.

Finally, the President will make clear that in order to strengthen Social Security and Medicare and to lower the deficit responsibly, the ultrarich must pay their fair share. There is no—no—conceivable scenario where wealthy CEOs should ever pay a lower rate than nurses and teachers and firefighters, but that is precisely how Republicans preferred it when they cut taxes for the ultrarich under Donald Trump.

It is as if Republicans care more about making sure the rich stay rich than they do about building ladders to the middle class, than they do about keeping middle-class people in that position.

Now, when President Biden called out Republicans for targeting Social Security and Medicare, they erupted

with feigned outrage during his State of the Union. But, to this day, Speaker McCARTHY and House Republican leadership have failed to present their own plan to the American people.

Speaker McCARTHY, it is now March 6. Where is your plan? Speaker McCarthy, where is your plan? The President is about to release his budget. Are you going to release yours anytime soon? Enough with the dodging. Enough with the excuses. Show us your plan, and then show us how it is going to get 218 votes on your side of the aisle.

Americans deserve to see for themselves what Democrats and Republicans propose for the future of the country. Republicans should come clean with the American people about what cuts they are pushing and explain how those cuts will cause unnecessary pain for millions of Americans across the country.

##### RAIL SAFETY

Madam President, now on rail safety, it is a busy time for the Senate, as we get to the bottom of what went wrong last month in East Palestine.

Last week, my colleagues Senator BROWN, a Democrat, and Senator VANCE, a Republican, introduced the bipartisan Railway Safety Act of 2023. I promise to work with them and with colleagues on both sides to push this bill forward.

This Thursday, the Environment and Public Works Committee, under the able leadership of Chairman CARPER, will also hear from Norfolk Southern's CEO Alan Shaw. I expect a candid, honest, clear-eyed discussion about how we can prevent another East Palestine in the future. And while I am glad that Norfolk Southern's CEO is testifying, we cannot have an open debate, an honest debate, in Congress about rail safety unless Republicans acknowledge how they spent years opposing safety rules intended to prevent accidents similar to the one in Ohio.

The story of rail safety deregulation over the last decade has been a disturbing tale of Republicans placing profits over people and currying favor with the rail lobby, all at the expense of workers' and families' safety.

As far back as the Obama administration, Republicans pushed numerous bills to weaken environmental standards, delay safety upgrades, and even prohibit—prohibit—Federal funding for Amtrak.

Under President Trump's watch, it became easier to transport flammable liquids and hazardous materials without proper oversight. Under President Trump's watch, it also became easier to cut back on staffing requirements while operating a train. And it was the Trump administration that killed proposals to expand electronic brake requirements across the industry. The reason for that delay? The Trump administration thought it was "not economically justified."

You can't come up with a better slogan for Republicans' attitude toward rail safety than this: not economically